

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENTTED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Tradomark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10/706,010 Robert E. Dickerson 11/12/2003 84505JLT 6550 09/27/2004 EXAMINER Paul A. Leipold SCHILLING, RICHARD L Patent Legal Staff Eastman Kodak Company ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1752

343 State Street Rochester, NY 14650-2201

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/706,010		DICKERSON ET AL	
Office Action Sumi	nary	Examiner		Art Unit	
		Richard L Schilling		1752	
The MAILING DATE of this Period for Reply	communication appe	ears on the cover she	eet with the co	orrespondence add	ress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS CO - Extensions of time may be available under th after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date - If the period for reply specified above is less - If NO period for reply is specified above, the - Failure to reply within the set or extended per Any reply received by the Office later than the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	OMMUNICATION. e provisions of 37 CFR 1.130 of this communication. than thirty (30) days, a reply maximum statutory period wi iod for reply will, by statute, or ee months after the mailing	6(a). In no event, however, r within the statutory minimum Il apply and will expire SIX (6 cause the application to bec	may a reply be time of thirty (30) days MONTHS from to	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this com	nmunication.
Status					
 1) Responsive to communicate 2a) This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in colosed in accordance with the 	2b)⊠ This a condition for allowand	action is non-final. ce except for formal			merits is
Disposition of Claims					
4)	is/are withdrawed. d. ted to.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 N Applicant may not request that Replacement drawing sheet(s) 11)☐ The oath or declaration is ob	ovember 2003 is/are any objection to the dr including the correctio	e: a)⊠ accepted or rawing(s) be held in ab n is required if the dra	oeyance. See : wing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). cted to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a) All b) Some * c) No 1. Certified copies of the 2. Certified copies of the 3. Copies of the certified application from the In * See the attached detailed Offi	ne of: priority documents priority documents copies of the priority ternational Bureau (have been received. have been received y documents have b (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	in Application	n No I in this National Sta	age
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing B Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-12-03.	Review (PTO-948) 0-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper 5) 🔲 Notice	iew Summary (P No(s)/Mail Date e of Informal Pate :	PTO-413) c ent Application (PTO-15	52)

Art Unit 1752

1. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obvious-type or non-obvious-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornam, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78 (d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a Terminal Disclaimer. A Terminal Disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending application Serial No. 10/706,191 and claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/706,655. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application and the copending applications are essentially the same except for the speeds of the screens, silver halide elements and systems which speeds substantially overlap.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been

Art Unit 1752

patented.

- 2. The prior art submitted by applicants has been considered. Dickerson et al. '554 is cited of interest in the art as disclosing X-ray film systems with two tabular silver halide layers coated on each side of the support. The tabular silver halide grains in Dickerson et al. have different aspect ratios and diameters from those of the instant claims.
- 3. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mr. Schilling at telephone number (571) 272-1335.

RLSchilling:cdc

September 22, 2004

RICHARD L SCHILLING PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1100 / 750